



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, June, 1894.

THE RELATION OF THE 'BLOOMS OF KING ALFRED' TO THE ANGLO-SAXON TRANSLATION OF BOETHIUS.

THE work known as 'The Blooms of King Alfred' is found in a single manuscript, Cott. Vitell. A xv. (Beowulf MS.), in the British Museum. A transcript of this, made by Junius, is preserved in the Bodleian Library at Oxford (MS. Junius 70).

The complete text has been printed twice; by Cockayne, in 'The Shrine,' London, 1864-1869, pp. 163-204; by W. Hulme in *Englische Studien*, xviii, pp. 332-356. The work is, for the most part, a translation of portions of Augustine's Soliloquies and Epistle 147, entitled 'De Videndo Deo.'

The work has been ascribed to Alfred by most modern authorities, mainly on the authority of the statement with which the manuscript abruptly closes. "Hær endiað þa cwidas þe ælfred kining alæs of þære bec þe we hatað on." *Englische Studien*, 18, 356, 17.

Thomas Wright ('Biographia Britannica Literaria, Anglo-Saxon Period,' London, 1842, p. 394,) puts it among Alfred's works, but notes that it is not mentioned by the "old writers." Lappenberg ('Geschichte von England,' Hamburg, 1843, i, p. 337) mentions it as among the translations ascribed to Alfred "mit mehr oder weniger Grund." Pauli, in his 'Life of Alfred' (Thorpe's Translation, p. 186), states as objections to Alfred's authorship: that the preface of the 'Blooms' differs from the prefaces of the King's known works, in that it does not show that the translator had in mind any definite aim in making his translation; that the work is not mentioned by any authority as among Alfred's works; that the work is written in impure Saxon, a fact not to be explained by assuming incorrect transcription of an early work.

Professor Wülker, in an article in Paul and Braune's *Beiträge*, iv (1877), pp. 101-131, "Über die angelsächsische Bearbeitung der

Soliloquien Augustin's," treats the work with especial reference to its sources and authorship. He finds in it, in addition to the translations of portions of the Soliloquies and the 'De Videndo Deo,' passages that are translations of extracts from Augustine's 'De Civitate Dei' and Gregory's *Moralia* and *Dialogues*, as well as many additions of original matter. In his discussion of the question of authorship the main points are: (1) The additions to the original are not such as a monk would write, but such as a man of high rank, if not a king, would be likely to make. (2) The vocabulary is like that of the works of Alfred. (3) The work resembles the King's translation of Boethius in its expressions for the principal ideas, the setting of the dialogue, and the formulæ for opening and closing the main divisions of the work. (4) The whole manner of treating the original Latin is like that of Alfred in his translations, especially in the 'Boethius.' (5) In answer to the objection that the work is not mentioned by the old authorities among the works of Alfred, he endeavours to prove that we have in it a portion of the King's *Encheiridion* or *Handbōc*, which is described by Asser, and referred to twice by William of Malmesbury.

The object of my article is to contribute to the settlement of the question of authorship by showing that the 'Blooms' and the 'Boethius' are the work of the same writer. The more general points of likeness between the two works have been noticed by Wülker and others; in fact, they could hardly escape the observation of any careful reader. I shall endeavour to show that the resemblance is much closer, and the relation of the works much more intimate than has hitherto been supposed. Part of the material here presented is from my thesis, 'The Blooms of King Alfred,' Johns Hopkins University, 1887 (not printed).

Before passing to the consideration of these closer resemblances, it will be well to speak of those points of general likeness that have been noticed already. The subjects treated in the two works are of the same general nature; the 'Blooms' treats of the knowledge

of God, the immortality of the soul, and the soul's condition in the future state; the 'Boethius' touches the questions of God's government of the universe, true happiness, the reward of the good and punishment of the wicked, fate and foreknowledge. Both of the Latin originals are in the form of dialogue. The translations are alike in their modification of the original form; both make the questions and answers shorter, introducing dialogue where the originals have continuous speech. In both translations the discussion is less philosophical than in the originals, and more in the tone and manner of Christian theology. Both works are free translations, and have many additions of original matter. In both works the translation is closest at the beginning, and the additions of original matter more numerous and extensive towards the end. In the 'Blooms' the dialogue is between *Gescēadwisness* and the writer; in the 'Boethius,' mainly between *Wisdōm* and the writer. The speeches of Augustine and Boethius are introduced by the form "Ðā cwæð ic," the

speeches of *Gescēadwisness* by "Ðā cwæð hēo," and the speeches of *Wisdōm* by "Ðā cwæð hē." These are the points of general likeness hitherto noticed.

We pass now to the consideration of those passages that show a much closer resemblance and a more intimate relation between the two works.

I. Simple verbal correspondences.

(1) Here are first to be considered further points of likeness in the setting of the dialogue. A very common formula of transition from one question to another is the following: "You seem to understand this point well enough, but I would like to ask you, etc."; or, "You have explained this point clearly enough, but I would like to have you show me, etc." Examples of this follow.

In quoting I refer to Hulme's text of the 'Blooms,' *Englische Studien* xviii, pp. 332-356, to Fox's edition of the Anglo-Saxon 'Boethius,' to the Benedictine edition of Augustine's Works, and to the edition of Boethius in the Teubner Texts.

BL.

Nu ic gehire hwæt ðu woldest witan. Ac ic wolde witan ærest æt þe, etc. 349,36.

Genoh rihte þu hyt hæfst ongytan. Ac ic wolde þæt wit fengen eft þider wit ær wæron. 350,19.

Ful ri[t]hte þu me hæfst geandwyrd. Ac ic þe wolde acsian, etc. 340,8.

Wel þu me lerst. Ac ic gemun, etc. 342,10.

Gode þanc þæt þu hyt swa wel ongitst. Ac ic wolde witan, etc. 348,27.

See also: 339,8; 340,11; 340,35; 344,21; 348,32; 350,37; 353,22.

(2) Further, it is to be noted that both works use the same forms to express assent to a statement, and to acknowledge the force of a

BOET.

Ic wat nu hwæt þu woldest witan. Ac me lyste bet þæt þu me sædest, etc. 142,12.

Swa hit is swa þu segst. Ac ic wolde þæt wit unc wendon sume hwile to þises folces spræce. 236,10.

Genog þu me hæfst gefrylsod þære tweonge mines modes. Ac ic ðe wolde giet ascien, etc. 248,24.

Swiþe ryht is þin lar. Ac ic wolde ðe nu myngian. 240,11.

þu eart gesæling þæt þu hit swa ongiten hæfst. Ac ic wolde þæt, etc. 126,19.

See also: 126,4; 140,20; 142,23; 160,7; 174,30; 198,3; 198,17; 216,9; 242,12.

reason, or the sufficiency of an argument. Examples:

BL.

Ic eom gepafa þæs þe þu me segst. 343, 15.

Genog soð þu sædest. 347, 37.

Soð ðu me sægest. 350, 14.

Genog sweotol hyt is. 353, 17.

See also; 348, 20; 351, 47.

BOET.

Ic eom genog wel gepafa ðæs þe þu sægst. 126, 26.

Genog riht ðu segst. 120, 18.

Genog soþ þæt is þæt þu segst. 182, 31.

Genog sweotol hit is. 136, 11.

See also; 178, 3; 182, 33; 198, 3;

(3) Closely related to the preceding are the forms used to express approval of the replies of Reason, and those used by Reason to express approval or disapproval of the perception

BL.

Genoh rihte þu hyt hæfst ongytan. 350,19.
Genoh wel ðu hyt ongitst. 337,39.

Genoh rihte þu hyt understentst. 340,37; 340,11.

Me ðincð nu þæt þu hæbbe genoh swetole gesæd etc. 353,9.

Me ðincð nu ðað þu hyt me hefdest genoh swætele gereahst. 352,40.

Ic wundrige hwi (MS. hwu) þu hæbbe swa ræðe forgitan þæt ðu nu lytle ær andætta were. 348,40.

(4) Then, again, in the Anglo-Saxon translations, Augustine and Boethius use expressions strikingly similar to tell their doubts

BL.

Gif þe be ængum þissa þinga awiht twoege þonne secge þu me þæt. 349,20.

Ymbe hwæt twæost þu nu, hu nu ne were ðu ær geþafa þæt God were æce and ælmihtih. 350,26.

See also: 350,37.

Ac þreo þing me habbað swioðost gedrefed. 343,7.

Ac ic wolde witan swa be Gode on minre gesceawisnesse and on minum ingeþance þæt me nan þing gemyrran ne mahte (MS. matte). 338,8.

þu me behete þæt þu me woldest me getecan þæt ic mihte God geseon, etc. 342,11.

Ac sege gyt hwæthwuga swetolor ymb þæt, þæt ic mage openlicor ongytan hwæthwugu be ðam wisdom. 347,2.

Ful gesceadlice ðu me andswarast and ful rihte. 344,33. Swiðe wundorlice and swiðe soðlice ðu lerst and swiðe wel þu me hæfst aretne and on godum tohopan gebrohtne. 342,31.

Na ne ondræde ic hi me nawit swiðe. 339,3.

and reasoning of Boethius or Augustine. In these cases, again, the forms used in the two works are very much alike. Examples:

BOET.

Genoh rihte ðu hit ongitst. 142,20; 178,25.
Genoh ryhte þu spyrast, swa hit is swa þu segst. 92,18.

Genog sweotole ðu hæfst me gesæd. 142,18.

Hu ne is þe nu genoh sweotole gesæd. 34,19.

Ic wundrige hwi þu hæbbe forgiten eall þæt þæt wit ær spræcon. 248,2.

and perplexities, to request fuller explanation, and to express satisfaction at the removal of difficulties. Examples:

BOET.

Ic nat ful geare ymbe hwæt þu gyt tweost; gesege me, nu þu cwist þæt þu naht ne twoege þætte God þisse worulde rihtere sie. 12,12.

Sum twoe me hæfþ swiþe gedrefed. 244,14.

Ic hit wiste eac ær be sumum dæle, ac me hæfde þios unrotnes amerredne. 172,2.

Ðu me gehete nu lytle ær þæt þu hi woldest me getæcan. 126,9.

Ðeah ic his nu hwæt hweg ongite, ic wolde ðeah hit fullicor and openlicor of ðe ongitan. 120,8.

Ac ic wolde get þæt þu me hwæt hwegu openlicor gereahste be þære wisan, etc. 216,10; Ic wolde þæt ðu me sædest get sweotolor ymbe ða opre god, etc. 142,2.

Swiþe rihtlice and swiþe gesceadwislice þu hæfst me ofercumen and gefangen, þæt ic ne mæg no wiþcweþan. 134,27. Wel þu me hæfst aretne on ðam tveon and on þære gedrefednesse, etc. 246,11.

Ne ondræde ic hi me nauht nu. 76,19.

The extracts compared show very plainly the striking likeness of the works in respect to the setting of the dialogue and the conduct of the argumentation.

(5) Following are a few more instances of

BL.

Nis *þæt* nan wundor. 332,21; 334,36; 342,37; 343, 20.

Wel, la, God feder, wel. 336,30.

Æfter *þæs* lichoman gedale and *þære* sawle. 349,45; 350, 34; 353, 23; 353,42.

þa hwile *þa* he in *þisse* worlde byð. 342,30;
þa hwile *þe* we on [on] *þisse* wurlde beoð. 349,5.

Ne truige ic na us swa wel, ne nawer neah. 352,6.

Do nu *þa* lufe ðriddan to eacan *þam* geleafan and *þam* tohopan. 341,10.

Gyf se[*þam*] hlaford ðe hwilc spel segð. . . .
Ðinc *þe* hweðer *þe* awuht æt his segene twoege. . . .
Ða cwæð ic. Nese, la, nese, nis nan to ðam ungelyfedlic spel, gyf he hyt segð, *þæt* ic hym ne gelife. 351.26.

II. We come now to the second general class of correspondences. This comprises those cases in which both the Anglo-Saxon passages compared are translations of the Latin.

In these cases it is particularly to be noted that the Anglo-Saxon gives a *free* translation

BL.

Be *þinre* hese seo sunne bringð leohtne dæg and se mona leoht on nyht. 335,16.

Sol exercet diem, luna temperat noctem. Sol. i, 4.

Hwæðer si *þin* ealde gytsung and seo gemæhð eallunga of ðinum mode astyfcod were and wyrtwalod *þæt* heo gyt growan myht. 344,22.

Aut nihil edomandum nobis remanere, aut nihil nos omnino profecisse, omniumque illorum quæ resecta credimus tabem manere. Sol i, 18.

BOET.

Nis *þæt* nan wundor. 110,9; 128,36; 186,27; 204,26; 214,8; 224,19; 226,21; 232,32; 234,23, & 28; 240,22.

Wel, la, men, wel. 144,23.

Wel, la, wisan men, wel. 238,28.

Æfter *þæs* lichoman gedale and *þære* sawle. 68,12.

Ða hwile ðe he on *þisse* worulde biþ. 122,16;

þæt ge don ne mægdon, ne furþum nawer neah. 64,5.

Uton nu . . . geecan *þone* anweald and *þæt* geniht, don *þær* weorþscipe to and gereccan *þonne þa þreo* to anum. 120,27.

Gyf *þu* nu gesawe sumne swiþe wisne man, *þe* hæfde swiþe goda oferhyda. . . . hwæþer ðu woldest cweþan *þæt* he wære unwyrþe anwealdes, and weorþscipes. Ða andsworede Boetius and cwæþ, Nese, la, nese, gif ic hine swelcne gemete, ne cwæþe ic næfre *þæt* he sie unweorþe anwealdes and weorþscipes. 96,23.

of the Latin, and that, while the Anglo-Saxon passages compared show close resemblance, the Latin passages which they translate differ widely in expression; or, to state it in another way, Latin passages from the two works differing widely in expression are translated by nearly the same Anglo-Saxon.

BOET.

Swa eac sio sunne bringþ leohte dagas, and se mona liht on niht. 74,24.

Quod Phoebus roseum diem Curru provehit aureo, Ut quas duxerit Hesperos Phoebe noctibus imperet. ii, met. 8,5-8.

Hwæþer nu se anweald hæbbe *þone þeaw þæt* astificige unþeawas and awyrtwalige of ricra manna mode. 94,22.

Num vis ea est magistratibus, ut utentium mentibus virtutes inserant vitia depellant? iii, Prosa, 4,2-3.

Gif ðu ærest awyrtwalast of ðinum mode *þa* leasan gesælþa. 78,33.

Tu quoque falsa tuens bona prius. Incipe colla iugo retrahere. iii, met. 1,11-12.

BL.

þin ealde gytsung and seo gemæhð. 344,22.
For the Latin see the extract next preceding.

Se God sealde fridom manna sealum, *þæt* hy moston don swa good swa yfel swæðer hy woldon, and gehet (MS. gehec) good eadlean ðam wel dondum and yfel *þam* yfel dedum. 335,36.

Cujus legibus arbitrium animæ liberum est, bonisque præmia et malis poenæ, fixis per omnia necessitatibus distributæ sunt. Sol. i, 4.

þu us sealdest and gyt silst *þæt* angyt *þæt* we ofercumað *þone* dwolan (*þæt*) *para* manna sawla næbben nan edlean æfter *þisse* worulde heora gearnunge swa godes swa yfeles swæðer hi her doð. 335,4.

Deus per quem improbamur eorum errorem, qui animarum merita nulla esse apud to putant. Sol. i, 3.

Mid ðam gode ys gegyered se æwilm ælces godes. 335,38. No Latin. For ðam nanre sawle eagan ne beoð full hale ge hyre God myd to geseonne buton *þisum þriom.* 341,11.

Sine tribus istis igitur anima nulla sanatur, ut possit Deum suum videre. Sol. i, 12.

Ac gehæl mine eahgan and untyn. . . and adrif fram me dysig and ofermæto. 336,2.

Sana et aperi oculos meos Expelle a me insaniam. Sol. i, 5.

Gyf he ðonne unhale æagan æfð, *þonne* be-
þearf he *þæt* hyne man lære *þæt* he lochige
ærest on *þonne* woh, ðonne on gold and on
seolfor; *þonne* he æaðe on *þæt* locian (mæg),
on fyr, ær ðam he ongearn *þa* sunnan locie.
Siððam he *þonne* *þat* geleornod hæbbe, *þæt*
is eagan nanwiht *þæt* fyr ne onscyniað, hawie
þonne on steorran and on monan, ðonne oðre
sunnan scynan, ær ðam he on hi selfe locige;
and swa ylce be *þære* oðrere sunnan, *þe* we
ær ymbe specon, *þæt* is wysdom. 346,35.

Primo enim quædam illis demonstranda sunt quæ non per se lucent, sed per lucem videri possint, ut vestis, aut paries, aut aliquid

BOET.

Hwæt ðu wast *þæt* me næfre seo gitsung and seo gemægþ ðisses eorðlican anwealdes for wel ne licode. 58,23.

Scis, inquam, ipsa minimum nobis ambitionem mortalium rerum fuisse dominatum. ii, Pr. 7,1-2.

Forþæm he gesceop twa gesceadwisan gesceafta frio, englas and men, *þam* he geaf micle gife freodomes, *þæt* hi moston don swa god swa yfel swæþor swa hi woldon. 244,29.

Frustra enim bonis malisque præmia poenæ proponuntur quæ nullus meruit liber ac voluntarius motus animorum. v. Pr. 3,83-85.

Forþam *þa* godan næfre ne beoþ bedælde *para* edleana hiora godes, ne *þa* yfelan næfre *para* wita ðe hi gearniap. 188,3.

In quo perspicuum est numquam bonis præmia numquam sua sceleribus deesse supplicia. iv, Pr. 3,2-4.

þa godan habban god edlean hiora godes and ða yflan habban wite hiora yfles. 232,17. No Latin.

And openum eagum ures modes we moten geson ðone æþelan æwelum ealra goda, *þæt* eart ðu. Forgif us ðonne hale eagan ures modes *þæt* we hi *þonne* moton afæstnian on *þe*, and todrif *þone* miste ðe nu hangaþ beforan ures modes eagum. 132,29.

Da fontem lustrare boni, da luce reperta.

In te conspicuos animi defigere visus.

Dissice terrenæ nebulas. iii met. 9,23-25.

Hwæt *þu* wast *þæt* *þa* men *þe* habbaþ unhale eagan ne magon ful eaþe locian ongearn *þa* sunnan ðonne hio beorhtost scinþ, ne furþum on fyre, ne on nan wuht beorhtes hi ne lyst locian, gif se æppel lef biþ; swa biop *þa* synnfullan mod ablend mid hiora yfelan willan, *þæt* hi ne magon geson *þæt* liot *þære* beorhtan soþfæstnesse, *þæt* is se hehsta wisdom, ac him biþ swa *þæm* fuglum and *þæm* diorum, *þe* magon bet locian on niht ðonne on dæg; se dæg blent and ðiostraþ hiora eagan, and ðære nihte *þiostro* hi onlihtaþ. 204,26.

Nequeunt enim oculos tenebris assuetos ad

BL.

horum. Deinde quod non per se quidem, sed tamen per illam lucem pulchrius effulgeat, ut aurum, argentum, et similia, nec tamen ita radiatum ut oculos lædat. Tunc fortasse terrenus iste ignis modeste demonstrandus est, deinde sidera, deinde luna, deinde auroræ fulgor, et albescentis coeli nitro. In quibus . . . pro sua quisque valetudine assuescens, . . . solem videbit. Tale aliquid sapientiæ studiosissimis, nec acute, jam tamen videntibus, magistri optimi faciunt. Sol. i, 23.

These passages furnish the strongest kind of evidence that both translations are the work of one man. If such correspondences were found to exist between two *original* works, they might be explained on the ground that the author of one of the works had borrowed from the other, but in the case of two *translations* such an explanation is in a high degree unsatisfactory. Two translators rendering the same original literally might use the same forms of expression, but even this is not very probable; much less probable is it that two translators would use the same expression to render Latin passages differing widely in expression; and it is in the highest degree improbable, if not impossible, that a translator would borrow expressions from the translation of a different work by another man. On the other hand, a man making a free translation

BL.

Hu ne sint æalle halga bec ful neah full be undeadlycnesse þære sawle. 351,2.

For ðam þara bysena (MS. byra) ys ma on halgan bocum þonne efre ariman mage. 352,19.

Æfter þæs lichoman gedale and þære sawle. 349,45; 350,34; 353,23; 353,42.

þætte nefre nan man of ðisse carcerne pises andweardan lyfes swa gewislice witan ne myhte. 351,7.

And seo sawle of þære carcerne gæð þæs lichaman aletan byð (MS. byd). 354,39.

For ði me þincð swiðe dysi man þe wilnat þæt hine eallunga ongytan swelcne swilc he

BOET.

lucem perspicuæ veritatis ad tollere similesque avibus sunt, quarum intuitum nox inluminat dies cæcat. iv, Pr. 4,89-92.

of two works similar in character would, in the second, very naturally make use of expressions that he had used in the first, wherever the thought of his second original might suggest them. Expressions that he had worked out *once* as satisfactory forms for rendering the thoughts of the original would inevitably come into his mind, whenever he met the same or similar thoughts in another work, upon whose translation he was working. These cases of striking likeness cannot be reasonably and satisfactorily accounted for unless we hold that both translations are the work of the same hand.

III. In the third class of correspondences we bring together passages of the 'Blooms' that are original additions, for comparison with passages of the 'Boethius' that are translations of the Latin.

BOET.

Hu ne wast ðu þætte ealle bec sint fulle þara bisna þara monna þe ær us wæran. 102,11.

Atqui plena est exemplorum vetustas. iii, Pr. 5,3.

Æfter þæs lichoman gedale and þære sawle. 68,12.

Quid, inquam, est quod ad hos de fama post resolutum morte suprema corpus attineat? ii, Pr. 7,75-76.

Sipþan heo ontiged biþ and of þam carcerne þæs lichoman onliesed biþ. 68,14.

Sin vero bene sibi mens conscia terreno carcere soluta cælum libera petit? ii, Pr. 7,79-80.

Swilc is se wisdom þæt hine ne mæg nan mon of þisse worulde ongytan swilcne swilc he

BL.

is *þa* hwile *þe* we on *þysse* worlde beoð. . . .
Ac ælc fagnað *þæs þe* læste he ongytan mæg
be hys andgytes mæðe. 342,23.

For ðam hy (i. e. æalle *þa* gesceaftas) sint
gebridloð mid ðam bridle, Godes bebodu.
335,35.

Se hæft gesceapena twa æca gesceafta, *þæt*
sint engelas and manna sauwela, *þam* he
s[c]ealde sunne dæl ecra gyfa. 348,47.

And hæfde twa gesceawissa and æca ges-
ceafta gesceapena, *þæt* sint engelas
and manna saula, ðam he hæfð forgifen æca
gyfa; ða gyfa hi ne ðurfon næfre alætan. 350,27.

On *þa* ylcan wisan hweorfað ealle gesceaft-
ta. Wrixleað sume *þa* on oððer wyssan, swa
þat þa ylcan eft ne cumað *þær* ðær hy er
weron, eallunga swa swa hy er wæron. Ac
cumað oðre for hy, swa swa leaf on treowum
and æppla; gears and wyrtan and treoweu
foraldiað and forseriað, and cumað oððer
grenu, wexeð and gearwað and ripað, for *þat*
hy eft onginnað searian; and swa eall nytenu
and fugelas, swelces ðe nu ys lang æall to
arimanne. 335,23.

Forði ic ne mæg na hu ælles gelyfan; for
þam he swa micla and swa manega (MS. mare
ga) and swa wundorlice gesewena gesceafta
gesceapen hæfð, and *þam* æallum stiorð and
hi æalle gemetgað, and oððre hwile gegiereð
myd ðam winsumestum wlitum, oðre hwile
eft ongiereð and geungewlitegað. He weal(t)
þara kynninga, ðe mæstne anweald hæbbað
þisse myddangeardes; ða beoð eallum man-
num gelice acende and æac oðrum mannum
gelice sweltað; *þa* læt ricsian *þa* hwile *þe* he
wyle. 350,41.

BOET.

is. Ac ælc winð be his andgites mæpe *þæt* he
hine wolde ongitan gif he mihte. 250,34.

Omne enim quod cognoscitur non secundum
sui vim sed secundum cognoscentium potius
comprehenditur facultatem. v, Pr. 4,71-74.

Ic wille nu mid giddum gecypan hu wundor-
lice Drihten welt eallra gesceafta mid ðam
bridlum his anwealdes. 88,2.

Quantas rerum flectat habenas Natura
potens, quibus immensum Legibus orbem
provida servet Stringatque ligans inresoluto
Singula nexu, placet arguto. Fidibus lentis
promere cantu. iii, met. 2,1-6.

Ac se anwealda hæfþ ealle his gesceafta swa
mid his bridle befangene. 74,5.

Hanc rerum seriem ligat Terras ac pelagus
regens Et cælo imperitans amor. Hic si frena
remiserit, etc. ii. met. 8,13-16.

See also, 174,18; 234,22.

Forþam he gesceop twa gesceadwisan ge-
sceafta frio, englas and men, *þam* he geaf
micle gife freodomes, *þæt* hi moston don swa
god swa yfel swæpor swa hi woldon. He
sælde swiþe fæste gife and swiþe fæste æ mid
þære gife ælcum menn oþ his ende. 244,29.

Frustra enim bonis malisque præmia poe-
næve proponuntur quæ nullus meruit liber ac
voluntarius motus animorum. v, Pr. 3,83-85.

Hu his gesceafta weaxaþ and eft waniaþ
ðonne ðæs tima cymþ, and of heora sæde
weorþaþ eft geedniwade swylce hi þonne
weordon to edsceafta. 150,12.

Jam vero quanta est nature diligentia, ut
cuncta semine multiplicato propagentur. iii,
Pr. ii, 65-66.

Ðu þe ealle þine gesceafta gesewenlice and
eac ungesewenlice wunderlice gesceope and
gesceadwislice heora weltst. 128,4.

O qui perpetua mundum ratione gubernas
Terrarum cælique sator qui tempus ab ævo
Ire jubes stabilisque manens das cuncta
moveri. iii, met. 9,1-3. See also, 72,28-30. No
Latin.

þær ricsaþ an cyning se hæfþ anweald eallra
oþra cynga. 174,17.

Hic regum sceptrum dominus tenet. iv, met.
1,19.

BL.

Ðu wast æac genoh geare þæt he nane gesceafta ne forlet eallunga gewitan swa þæt hy to nawuihte weorðe, ne furðum þa ealra unweorðlicostan, ac he gewlitedað and gegerað æalle gesceafta and æft ungewlitedað and ungerað and æft edniowað. Swa wrixliað ealle ge nu þæt hy farað and instepe æft cumað, and weorðað eft to ðam ylcan wlite and to þære ylcan winsumnesse manna bearnum, þe wæron ær þam ðe Adam gesingode. 352,29.

þi ic ongyte þæt ðu lufast þone wisdom ofer æalle oðre þing; þæt me ðincð (MS. ðing) seo ðin hehste good and æac þin God: Ða cwæð ic, Soð ðu me sægest. Hwæt is se hehsta wysdom æalles buton þæt hehste good, oððe h[æ]wæt is þæt hehste good buton þæt ælc man on þisse wurlde swa miclum lufað Goð swa he wisdom lufað? 350,12.

Hu ne habbe wyt nu genoh sweetole gereahþ þæt wisdom ys þæt hehste good. 345,17.

Ic wene þeah ðæt hi cumen on swiðe manige wegas and þeah cumað æalle to anum hlaforde. Swa hit bið æac be þam wisdom. 346,13-21.

In these passages we have more evidence for the belief that the same writer made both translations. Such evidence taken alone would not prove this conclusively, for it might be objected that the writer of the 'Blooms' was familiar with the Anglo-Saxon 'Boethius' and borrowed from it. This evidence, however, very strongly confirms that previously considered, which, as I have shown, cannot be weakened by such an objection.

The translator of Augustine has added to his original many thoughts and expressions from the Anglo-Saxon 'Boethius,' in places

BOET.

And gemetgaþ þa feower gesceafta, þæt is wæter and eorþe and fyr and lyft, ða he þwarap and gewlitedaþ. hwilum eft unwlitedaþ and on oþrum hiwe gebrengþ and eft geedniwaþ; and tydreþ ælc tudor, and hit eft gehyt and gehelt ðonne hit forealdod bið and forsearod, and eft geeowþ and geedniwaþ þonne þonne he wile. 224,8.

Elementa in se invicem temperat et alterna commutatione transformat; eadem nascentia occidentiaque omnia per similes fetuum seminumque renovat progressus. iv, Pr. 6,78-81. See also, 128,4-132,38.

Hu ne wast ðu nu þæt eail moncyn is anmodlice gepafa þæt God is fruma ealra goda and wealdend ealra gesceafta; he is þæt hehste god. 134,32.

Deum rerum omnium principem bonum esse communis humanorum conceptio probat animorum. iii, Pr. 10,22-24.

Se ilca God is, swa swa we ær sædon, þæt hehste god and ða selestan gesælþa.

Confitendum est summum deum summi perfectique boni esse plenissimum: sed perfectum bonum veram esse beatitudinem constituimus: veram igitur beatitudinem in summo deo sitam esse necesse est. iii, Pr. 10,32-36.

See also, 136,5.

And þeah willniað ealle þurh mistlice paþas cuman to anum ende, þæt is, þæt hi wilniap þurh ungelice earnunga cuman to anre eadignesse, þæt is þonne God. 80,7.

Diverso quidem calle procedit, sed ad unum tamen beatitudinis finem nititur pervenire. iii, Pr. 2,3-5.

where they could be introduced effectively, and, while not slavishly following that work, has so kept the style of it, that it is reasonable to hold that he has borrowed from his own translation. The amount of this borrowing is large enough to warrant the statement that some of the 'Blooms' were gathered from the Anglo-Saxon 'Boethius.'

IV. Cases of correspondence in which the passage from the 'Blooms' translates Latin, while the passage from the 'Boethius' is an addition to the original. I have found only one such case, but it is an interesting one.

BL.

Ðu hæst me forlætan þa unrotnesse ðy læst ic awðer oððe on mode oððe on lichaman þy mettrumra si, and ic ne ongyte nane trimðe ne on mode ne on lichaman, ac æom ful nah ormod (MS. on mod). 347,47.

Aut valetudinem corporis considerare me iubes, cum ego ipse tabe confectus sim? Sol i, 26.

It will be noticed that there is nothing in the Latin of the Soliloquies to suggest *unrotnesse* and *ful nah ormod*, while the whole passage from the 'Boethius' is an addition. The likeness of expression is not such as to indicate borrowing, but such as is reasonably explained on the supposition that the same man wrote both passages. The evidence here, however, is not very strong.

It should be noted in passing that while we

BL.

Ne ealle þa þe on heofenum beoð nabbað gelic wuldor, ac ælc hefð be his gearunge swa wite swa wuldor swæðer he on byð. 354,6.

Engelum he gef be heora andefne, and manna saulum he gyfð, ælcra be hyre andefne, swilca gyfa. 349,2.

There are several nautical similes in the works; all of those in the 'Blooms' and one of those in the 'Boethius' are additions. The

BL.

Swa rihte swa swa scipes ancer-streng byð aþenæd on gerihte fram þam scype to þam ancre swa se ancer byð gefastnoð on ðære eorðan; þeah þæt scyp si ute on ðære sæ on þam yðum, hyt byð gesund untoslegen, gyf se streng aþolað, for ðam his byð se oðer ende fast on þære eorðan and se oðer on ðam scype. 339,24. No Latin.

See also, 339,33; 341,22; 341,36.

Swa swa scypes hlaforð (MS. ho feut) þonne þæt scyp ungetæslīcōst on ancre rit seo sæ hreohost byð, ðonne wot he gewiss smelte wedere towæard. 341,39. No Latin.

BOET.

Ac ic eom nu get on micle maran gedrefednesse geunrotsod, fulneah oþ ormodnesse. 246,13.

have a considerable number of cases in which an original passage from the 'Blooms' corresponds to a translation-passage from the 'Boethius,' we have but a single case in which a translation-passage of the 'Blooms' corresponds to an original passage of the 'Boethius.'

V. There are a few cases in which the Anglo-Saxon of each of the corresponding passages is an original addition.

BOET.

Hwæt þu Drihten forgeafe þam sawlum eard on biofonum and him þær gīst weorþlice gifa, ælcere be hire gearunge, and gedest þæt he scīnaþ swīpe beorhte, and ðeah swīpe mistlice birhtu, sume beorhtor, sume unbyrhtor, swa swa steorran, ælc be his gearunga. 132,18.

original one in the 'Boethius' is much more elaborate than those translated from the Latin, and very much like those in the 'Blooms.'

BOET.

Ne eart þu no eallunga to nauhte gedon, swa swa þu wenst; nis þe nu git nan unabrendlic broc getenge, forþam þe þin ancor is git on eorþan fæst, ðæt sint ða ealdormen, ðe we ær ymbe spræcon. 30,3.

Nondum est ad unum omnes exosa fortuna nec tibi nimium valida tempestas incubuit, quando tenaces hærent ancoræ quæ nec præsentis solamen nec futuri spem temporis abesse patiantur. ii, Pr. 4,28-31.

Swa swa god scīpstyra ongit micelne windhreoþe ær ær hit weorþe, and hæst fealdan þæt segl and eac hwīlum lecgan þone mæst and lætan þa betinge; gif he ær þweores windes bætte warnað he hine wīþ þæt weder. 250,13. No Latin.

Hwæt þu watst gif ðu þīnes scīpes segl on gean ðone wind tobrædst þæt þu þonne lætst eal eower færelð to þæs windes dome. 18,31.

Si ventis vela committeres, non quo voluntas peteret, sed quo flatus impellerent, promoveres. ii, Pr. 1,52-53.

VI. The points of general resemblance, to which Wülker and others have called attention I have already mentioned. I wish now to call attention to the fact that the two works have certain *favorite* themes in common. God's government of the universe, particularly as it is manifested in restraining and directing all created things in their courses and cycles of development, is a favorite theme with Boethius, and evidently had great attraction for his translator, as we find the passages that treat it freely and effectively rendered by him, and sometimes expanded by original additions. See Fox's 'Boet.' 74,5; 88,2; 128,4; 150,12; 156,37; 174,18; 224,8; 234,22; 232,27. In the Soliloquies this theme is not a prominent one, but we see very plainly that it was a favorite one with the Anglo-Saxon translator; he has introduced it frequently and elaborated it with a fondness that is unmistakable. See 335, 16; 335,23; 335,35; 350,41; 352,29. The subject of future reward and punishment is made prominent in both translations, and emphasis is given to the idea that all will not receive like reward or punishment, but that these will be proportioned according to merit. See 'Boet.' 132,18; 188,3; 202,21; 232,17. 'Bl.' 335,4; 349,2; 354,6. Both translators are fond of the thought that God created two intelligent beings, men and angels, and endowed them with everlasting gifts. See 'Boet.' 242,23; 244, 29; 256,19. 'Bl.' 348,47; 350,27; 349,2.

Recapitulation:—(1) There are striking resemblances between the 'Blooms' and the 'Boethius' in the setting of the dialogue, and in all things pertaining to the conduct of the discussion. (2) There are cases of close correspondence between Anglo-Saxon passages that translate Latin expressions widely different from each other. (3) There are original passages of the 'Blooms' closely resembling translation-passages of the 'Boethius.' (4) There is noticed one case of correspondence between a translation-passage of the 'Blooms' and an original passage of the 'Boethius.' (5) Passages that are original in both works correspond. (6) Both works dwell upon and enlarge the same themes.

In all cases of this nature, where it is sought to prove common authorship by correspondence of thought and expression, the evidence

must be cumulative. The strength of the argument does not lie in any one, or two, or more points, but in all points taken together. So in the case of the two works under discussion, the strongest argument for common authorship lies in the number and extent of the correspondences, rather than in those particular considerations that have been urged in each category. The amount of material here brought together is, I believe, abundantly sufficient to convince one who carefully examines it that the two translations are the work of the same hand. In such a consideration it should be kept in mind that the 'Blooms' is much shorter than the 'Boethius,' that it is composed of translations of passages from at least five different Latin works, and that it contains long additions of original matter.

It is not my purpose to consider the question of Alfred's authorship of either of these works. The solution of that question is, however, somewhat simplified if we have established the point of their common authorship. All the evidence that has been produced to prove the King to be the translator of 'Boethius' becomes evidence that he is the author of the 'Blooms,' and, on the other hand, all the evidence that goes to show that he is author of the 'Blooms' has weight to prove that he made the translation of the 'De Consolatione Philosophiæ.'

One point of chronology is, I think, established by this investigation. I have already called attention to the fact that we have *many* original passages of the 'Blooms' corresponding to translation-passages of the 'Boethius,' but only *one* case in which a translation-passage of the 'Blooms' corresponds to an original passage of the 'Boethius.' These passages show very plainly, as I have already stated, that the author of the 'Blooms' has taken many thoughts and expressions from the 'Boethius,' hence the 'Blooms' must have been written later than the 'Boethius.' Wülker puts it later than the 'Boethius' for other reasons (see 'Grundriss,' p. 419f.).

I have not yet made a careful comparison of these works with the other Alfredian translations, but I have noticed two interesting cases of correspondence with the 'Pastoral Care.'

BL. and BOET.

Se ðe hyne [wisdom] myð hys modes ægum geseon wele, he sceal of swiðe lytlum hyt ongynnan and þonne lytlum and lytlum stigan near and near stæpmelum, swilce he on sume hlædre stige and wylle weorðan uppe on sumu sæ clife. Bl. 346,41.

Ðu hæst me forlætan þa unrotnesse and ic ne ongyte nane trimðe ac æom fol nah ormod (MS. on mod). Bl. 347,47.

Ac ic eom nu get on micle maran gedrefednesse geunrotsod, fulneah oþ ormodnesse. 246,13, Boet.

Further investigation in this direction will, no doubt, throw further light upon the author-
University of Wisconsin.

RUDOLF HILDEBRAND.¹

WHILE it is an old and beautiful custom to adorn with a wreath, on the commemoration of their birthday, the tombs of those whom in their lifetime we loved or esteemed, it is an equally ancient usage among Germans to remember the living who are dear to us with an 'Angebinde' on the day of their birth. Professor Hildebrand, whose birthday we celebrate to-day, has shown us in his masterly way how the birth-day present—such is now the meaning of 'Angebinde'—originally was accompanied by a band, a 'Band' which was covered with appropriate verses or paintings. This band was intended to be a symbol of the spiritual bonds that were to be united anew on the birthday between the one who gave the band and its recipient. I should be more than satisfied could the few remarks which I intend to make here serve as a modest 'Angebinde' in the old sense, as a sign not only of the personal relations that bind me to my old teacher and friend, but also of the bonds of reverence and gratitude which unite the study of German at this University, and in our country in general, with the master of German philology.

For I consider him the greatest of the living

¹ Read before the Philological Association of Stanford University, at the joint celebration of the centennial of the birthday of Friedrich Diez, and of the seventieth birthday of Rudolf Hildebrand.

PASTORAL CARE.

Nu ic wilnige ðætte ðeos spræc stigge on ðæt ingeðonc ðæs leorneres, swæ swæ on sume hlædre, stæpmelum near and near, oððæt hio fæstlice gestonde on ðæm solore ðæs modes ðe hi leornige. Sweet's ed. 23,16.

Ðonne he hiene on unrotnesse oððe on ormodnesse gebringð. 166,11.

ship and chronology of these translations.

FRANK G. HUBBARD.

German philologists, and it is with a feeling of hesitation that I attempt here to sketch a picture of the scholar, the teacher and the German patriot. When several years ago Müllenhoff died, then Scherer and Zarncke, it was comparatively easy to assign to each one of these great representatives of German philology his proper place in the history of our science. Each one of these scholars was more or less identified with the development of one branch or another of German philology. In Müllenhoff we saw the great founder of the science of German antiquities, the strict follower of Lachmann, uniting the accurate method of the Lachmann school with the powerful gift of scientific combination and imagination. In Scherer we lamented the young, many-sided scholar who had successfully applied the methods of natural science to linguistic and literary research, while in Zarncke we lost the model of minute accuracy in literary investigations, the great editor and interpreter of the 'Nibelungenlied' and the 'Narrenschiff,' and the excellent, painstaking teacher. It is not so easy to describe, in like manner, with a few words, Hildebrand's scientific work. He has never had the ambition of surprising the world with new, startling hypotheses or of posing as a reformer of his science. Nor has he become the head of a so-called 'school' who made his pupils, as, for instance,